UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Who Betrays Neutrality Betrays Peace - - - - - - *Brent Dow Allinson*

Uncle Sam, Benedict - *O. A. Hammand*

A Pure White Light Is Always Shining - - - - - - - *Paul de Guzman*

THE STUDY TABLE
Charles A. Hawley

VOLUME CXXV NUMBER 6

Chicago, May 20, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 83
Jottings—J. H. H. 85
George Lansbury—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 86

ARTICLES—

Who Betrays Neutrality Betrays Peace—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 87
Uncle Sam, Benedict—O. A. HAMMAND 91
A Pure White Light Is Always Shining—PAUL DE GUZMAN 91
On the Pacifist Front—XIV 92

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—

Kinship with the Soil—UNA MORCE GIBSON 94
After the Harvest—ANN FRANCIS HILL 94
Invocation to the Manitou—CHAPMAN J. MILLING 94
The Continuous Crucifixion—EARL BIGELOW BROWN 94
Little Dictators—KATHARINE BROWN BURT 94

THE STUDY TALE—

Book Reviews—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 95

THE FIELD—

He Is an American!—*The Jewish American, Dallas, Texas* 82
Petition for Peace 96

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

He Is an American!

He is an American.

He hears an airplane overhead, and, if he looks up at all, does so in curiosity, neither in fear nor in the hope of seeing a protector.

His wife goes marketing, and her purchases are limited by her needs, her taste, her budget, but not by decree.

He comes home of an evening through streets which are well-lighted, not dimly in blue.

He reads his newspaper and knows that what it says is not concocted by a bureau but on honest, untrammeled effort to present the truth.

He has never had a gas mask on.

He has never been in a bomb-proof shelter.

He belongs to such fraternal organizations and clubs as he wishes.

He adheres to a political party to the extent that he desires—the dominant one if that be his choice, but with the distinct reservation that he may criticize any of its policies with all the vigor which to him seems proper—any others as his convictions dictate, even if it be one which holds that the theory of government of the country is wrong and should be scrapped.

He does not believe, if his party is out of power, that the only way in which it can come into power is through a bloody revolution.

He converses with friends, even with chance acquaintances, expressing freely his opinion on any subject without fear.

He does not expect his mail to be opened between posting and receipt, nor his telephone to be tapped.

He changes his place of dwelling and does not report so doing to the police.

He has not registered with the police.

He carries an identification card only in case he should be the victim of a traffic accident.

He thinks of his neighbors across international borders—of those to the north as though they were across a state line rather than foreigners—of those to the south more as strangers, since they speak a different language from his, and with the knowledge that there are now matters of difference between his government and theirs, but of neither with an expectancy of war.

He worships God in the fashion of his choice.

His children are with him in his home, neither removed to a place of greater safety, if young, nor, if older, ordered ready to serve the state with sacrifice of limb or life.

He has his problems, his troubles, his uncertainties, but all others are not overshadowed by the imminence of battle and sudden death.

He is a fortunate man.

He is an American.

—*The Jewish American, Dallas, Tex.*

(*Continued on page* 96)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXV MONDAY, MAY 20, 1940 No. 6

STANZAS

I

"Hail, Caesar" was the legions' cry
In snow and desert sand,
As burnished eagles, lifted high,
Were borne from land to land—
And martyrs in a catacomb
Watched the decline and fall of Rome!

II

"Heil Hitler" is the Nazis' cry
Aloud on plain and peak,
As swastikas like condors fly
Their farther prey to seek—
And men in prison camps await
The Reich's irrevocable fate!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

GOING, *** GOING, ***

Steadily this country is moving into war. We know it because we have traveled this road before. Every step is familiar, even the order in which the successive steps are taken. (*1*) The first step, of course, was the change made in the Neutrality Act last fall, when the government agreed to sell airplanes and other war material to the Allies. This was a definite enlistment in the war on the side of Britain and France. (*2*) The next step will be taken when the Allied cash begins to run low and it becomes necessary to buy goods on credit. Already, at this very moment, the public mind is being prepared for an attack upon the Johnson Act, which forbids the granting of credit or loans to foreign powers in debt to the United States government. In due course, perhaps early this coming fall, the Johnson Act will be repealed, and England and France will proceed forthwith to run up enormous debts in this country. (*3*) Then will come the day when credit will be as weak as cash. This will be the signal for the granting of loans to the Allied belligerents. Profitable, you know, for American business, since not a cent of these loans ever goes abroad, but every cent is duly expended right in this country for supplies! (*4*) Then, as the fighting in Europe moves on from disaster to disaster, and exhaustion becomes more and more apparent, the loans will begin to look as shaky as the credit and the cash. We shall have to guarantee those loans, in other words—(as though any loans were going to be worth anything when this war is done!)—"Where our treasure is, there will our heart be also." We will have invested in this war just as we did in the last war; and in this case, as in the last case, *we've got to save those investments.* (*5*) And that means, of course, joining in the war, sending our ships and men across the seas, to assure victory for the Allied powers! Victory in the last war, to be sure, brought us nothing. But this time it will be different, just as the war itself is different! And so we fool ourselves, learning nothing from the past! It is this journey upon which we are already well started. The first step has been taken, and the second is now being prepared. Public opinion is still dead set against entering into the fight—but so it was in the last war. Trust the government to handle public opinion, and betray the people as Judas betrayed Christ.

WHO'S WINNING THIS WAR?

We thought the Allies were winning it. Now, with Norway gone, and perhaps other Nazi victories recorded while this editorial is being printed, speculation is widespread as to what will happen if Germany wins the war. At the moment, of course, whatever the disasters here and triumphs there, nobody can guess the outcome. Yet are there trends, and one sure indication of these trends is Italy—and, in a lesser measure, Japan. What these nations decide to do in the next few weeks, or even days, may well constitute a clear answer to our question. Mussolini, let it be remembered, is just a vulgar huckster, waiting to sell his nation's honor, so-called, to the highest bidder—or, more accurately, perhaps, a shameless gambler, who is eager and ready to bet on the main chance. The moment he feels certain that Germany is winning this war, he will come in on the side of Germany—for a price, of course, bargained for on the principle of Shylock. If, on the other hand, he becomes convinced that Britain, in spite of all reverses, is likely in the end to win the victory, then he will plunge on the side of the Allies. The immense excitement over Italy as this editorial is being written is all due to the fact that Germany seems to be moving fast toward gaining permanently the upper hand, and Il Duce is poised for the jump. (Perhaps he will take it before these words appear in print!) If he hangs back, then we can be confident that, in spite of Norway, Nazi prospects are not so bright, after all. So we *do* have a means of knowing who's winning the war! Meanwhile, whoever is winning it, or may some

day win it, we can be certain that humanity is losing it. Whether Germany or Britain be on top, mankind is struggling and suffocating at the bottom. Humanity is every hour being defeated and drawing nigher unto death. The tides of battle flow this way and then that, but always they flow against the people. And we do not see it, because we are still guilty of the monstrous fallacy of identifying the cause of humanity with our country's cause—as though God pledged allegiance to a nation's flag! The time must come when we will cherish men for their own sake, since God has made them all "of one blood." Then there will be no wars, and no victors and vanquished, but all will be one in "the federation of the world."

"ENGLAND BETRAYS INDIA"

This is the title of an editorial in *The New Republic,* which alone among the great journals of America is telling the whole truth about what is going on in India. In this faraway part of the world, where Britain rules more than four times as many people as exist in all the Reich, the Empire is repudiating the very democracy which she insists she is fighting to save in Europe. How can we believe that, in Europe or elsewhere, there is anything but selfish imperialistic interests at stake, when in Asia these interests are the exclusive concern of English rule? What has happened in India is the final refusal of freedom to Indians. What is more, Britain has promised, through her Under-Secretary for India, Sir Hugh O'Neill, that the government will take "full measures" if Gandhi and the Congress start a campaign of civil disobedience. This phrase, "full measures," is a euphonious one, but what it really means is that Britain will unleash her war machine and do to the Indians what the Germans have done to the Czechoslovakians and the Poles, and the Russians to the Finns. The principle is always the same—"You do what we say —obey our orders, serve our cause—or take the consequences!" Of course, the situation does not *seem* the same in India, since England invaded and conquered and subdued that country over a hundred and eighty years ago, whereas Germany went into Poland, and Russia into Finland only yesterday. But the Indians are as helplessly enslaved as are the Poles, and far more so than the Finns, and thus, whether they like it or not, must help their imperial masters to win this war. Just when India will act is uncertain. Latest reports indicate that Gandhi is now mobilizing the Indian population for mass civil disobedience to the British crown. Already the native ministers have resigned in eight of the eleven provinces. The next step is a campaign of passive resistance on a grand scale. Then will come wholesale imprisonments, the beating up of sternly disciplined crowds, the murder of civilians, and, in the end, probably, bombings of cities and villages from the air. It will be a hideous spectacle—which, among other things, may well work havoc with American public opinion. In anticipation of events, the American League for Indian Freedom has been revived, with the Editor of this paper as National Chairman, and memberships and contributions are earnestly solicited at the office, 20 Vesey Street, New York City.

WOULD THE PREACHERS PRESENT ARMS?

Some of them would, if this country entered into the European war. Perhaps many of them would. Bishop Manning would snap his heels and stand at salute with a promptness which would surprise even the recruiting officers. The thirty-two who signed the Neibuhr statement would place themselves under the orders of any roughneck corporal of the guard who might think it worth while to command their services. A goodly number of sincere, devoted, sorely troubled men would follow along because convinced that this war, like the last war, like every war that is being fought *now,* is a war for a righteous cause, or because they knew not what else to do. But that there would be any such unanimity among the clergy as there was in the last war, or any such bloodcurdling exultation over the appeal to arms, is unthinkable. We are sure that even those who might support the war most dutifully would at the same time do so reluctantly, sadly, with cast-down and even broken hearts. And there would be hundreds, perhaps thousands, of ministers who would have nothing to do with the dirty business of fighting and killing Germans. Already they have taken their stand that war is wrong, immoral, unchristian, obscene, profane, and, when and if war comes, they will be true, whatever the cost, to what is now a conviction of their souls. It will be interesting to see what the government will do with these stalwart witnesses of Christ and his whole Gospel when they refuse to raise and salute flags, to recruit and sell liberty bonds, to serve as chaplains and Red Cross representatives, and even keep right on preaching "love your enemies," "resist not evil," "he that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword." We venture our guess that the government, cowardly always, will do in this war what it did in the last war—namely, proceed against obscure, nameless, helpless men, and persecute and punish them because they have no influence or fame with which to defend themselves. But will the big men —the Harry Emerson Fosdicks, the Bishop Lawrences, the Alan Chalmers'—stand for this? *They will not!* We prophesy a spectacle worth watching when Washington tackles this problem. Christ has defeated Caesar before, and he will do so again.

WORLD'S FAIRS

The reopening of the World's Fair in New York is a gallant gesture—almost of defiance! It makes one wonder what has become of the fair planned for Zurich, Switzerland, this summer of 1940 (if we remember rightly!), and what will become of Mussolini's great exposition planned for 1942. The New York Fair, in

this second year, will of course be largely devoted to entertainment features. Amusement rather than instruction will be the keynote of the occasion. But many of the most informing and inspiring exhibits of 1939 will still be in place; most of the industrial showrooms will be wide open; and a considerable number of the foreign pavilions will lift high the flags of their respective countries. The old title, "The World of Tomorrow," has been put by. We don't dare to think any more of the tomorrow which may be awaiting our world! In its place are the ideals of "Peace" and "Democracy," which are good battlecries for tomorrow, today, or any other time. Their use proves that we have not utterly abandoned our cause, and can thus still believe that war is not going to destroy us nor barbarism to engulf us. There are sad features of this reopened Fair—the Polish, Finnish, and Norwegian buildings, for example, matching this year the Czechoslovakian building last year. Equally tragic is the complete disappearance of the great Soviet Russia building, which was this winter pulled down stone by stone, and removed, with all its contents, to Moscow. This may be taken as a symbol of what has happened to Russia herself in the judgment of mankind—the whole Soviet nation gone from the landscape of the world's hopes and dreams! In its place, and central to the whole new edition of the Fair in features entertaining and informing alike, will be America, this great republic which never before looked quite so good as at this moment. Here in this country the peoples of the world have found peace in a brotherhood of men and women drawn from all the races, religions, and nationalities of this earth. Here in this country we believe in democracy, and are pegging away in the difficult and dangerous task of making democracy real among us in every field of life. Nothing could be more timely and appropriate than a celebration of America today, and we prophesy that a great host of our citizens will make their pilgrimage to the Flushing meadows, not merely to be amused, but also, and perhaps primarily, to proclaim their joy in this nation, and to dedicate themselves afresh to its eternal welfare. As John Greenleaf Whittier sang at the Centennial Exposition (1876):

> O make Thou us, through centuries long,
> In peace secure, in justice strong;
> And, cast in some diviner mould,
> Let the new cycle shame the old.

WENDELL WILLKIE

An astonishing thing took place in a moving-picture theatre in New York the other night. The theatre was a large one, filled with a wholly typical audience of ordinary people. The pictures of outstanding presidential candidates were thrown on the screen—Senator Taft, Vice-President Garner, Thomas W. Dewey, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Mr. Taft got no applause, Mr. Garner a mere smattering. Mr. Dewey and Mr. Roosevelt a good hand of about the same volume and intensity. Then came a picture not properly on the list at all—that of Mr. Wendell Willkie, public utility magnate—and the theatre rocked with enthusiasm. Applause for this man simply drowned every other demonstration, and left the established political figures nowhere. Now, what does this mean? Let it be remembered that Mr. Willkie is not in the campaign field. He is not a candidate for the presidency; he has no office, no manager, nor field representatives; he has put up no money and entered no primaries; he has no political record and will have no delegates at the convention. Furthermore, he is not being played up by the newspapers; the radio is saying nothing about him; he is minding his own business and going his own way. Yet a run-of-the-mine movie crowd applauds its head off when his picture is flashed on the screen in company with two such established favorites as the President and Mr. Dewey! What does this mean? May we be frank and say, we don't know? We should like at the start to have some more information—as, for example, is this episode characteristic only of New York, which is a world by itself, or is it being duplicated in other parts of the country, east, west, or south? Perhaps our readers can send us some reports. Meanwhile, we begin to suspect that something is going on in the deep under-consciousness of the American people. The collapse of the New Deal, the national debt coupled with the continuing deficit, unemployment as large as ever, a disintegrating Democratic Party, a warring labor world, the growing menace of a war-torn Europe—all these and many other disturbing factors in our contemporary life are leading to disquiet and perhaps to revolt. We are in the wilderness; Moses has grown old and worn; where is the Joshua to lead us into the Promised Land?

Jottings

UNITY hails with enthusiasm the nomination of Norman Thomas for the presidency. Not that there is any chance of the Socialist Party electing its ticket in November! But only that it is an infinite satisfaction to have a man associated with the presidential office who has not only good intentions but also a clear mind, who presents a platform of sound and not spurious liberalism, and who would really keep his promise to keep this country out of war.

Pollyanna Prize for 1940!—Awarded to Mr. Bedrich Stampfer, Czechoslovakian editor, who says: "The more territory Germany assumes, the weaker her position will become."

We have just seen, in an illustrated travel-book, a picture of "Bombay—a scene in one of the crowded streets of the Indian quarter." We wonder how we Americans would like to see a picture of "New York

—a scene in one of the crowded streets of the American quarter"!

Last year (1939) the most popular books in Germany were the *Bible,* Hitler's *Mein Kampf,* and Margaret Mitchell's *Gone with the Wind.* We suspect that, of these three books, *Gone with the Wind* was the one which was bought to be read.

We may have many ideas about a third term—there are good arguments pro and con! But we do not see how there can be but one idea about a President who plays covertly with the third term, to the increasing confusion, irritation, and dismay of the whole electorate.

Socrates said that he was the wisest man in Athens because he was the only man who knew that he knew nothing. On this basis we are all the wisest of men, for if we know anything it is that we know nothing—about what is going on in the world today.

J. H. H.

George Lansbury

I

There was tragedy in the death of George Lansbury at just the moment when the European war was breaking out into awful fury. Lansbury perhaps was happy in being spared at his great age the horrors that await his country and the world. But for the rest of us there is a dread symbolism in the passing of such a man at such a time. It seems like the quenching of a light which has been bravely shining through the gathering dark, and now disappears in the universal blackout of these days. Is there a place in our world any more for such a man? Must the saints be swallowed up in the universal onsweep of the new barbarism?

A few days before Lansbury's death, the British Government had begun rounding up officers and members of the Peace Pledge Union, a pacifist organization of which he was president. Did death intervene to protect the heroic old man from a third experience of imprisonment for his faith? Would Caesar have crucified another Christ?

II

George Lansbury was born in a tollhouse on a country road in Suffolk on February 21, 1859. After attending common schools, he learned the printer's trade. As a young man he entered politics, and in these early years was a Liberal. But he was soon too far to the left to remain comfortably in that party, and in due course he switched to the Social Democratic Federation, which led eventually to the British Labor Party. Here he attained cabinet rank, and in the days following the defection of Ramsay MacDonald served as Leader of the Party. Three interests occupied his life.

First, *labor!* Higher wages, lower hours, improved working and living conditions, better housing—all these and other causes held his firm allegiance. In his thought Lansbury was a Socialist, but of the romantic rather than the dialectic school. More than any other man of his time he was like our own 'Gene Debs. He had no such eloquence as Debs, no such capacity for public leadership. But he had the same tender heart and compassionate spirit, and from a sheer love of the workers and a burning sense of the justice of their cause, he gave himself to the movement for their liberation.

Secondly, *woman suffrage!* At a time when the militant suffragists were raging through the land like a hurricane, this gentle man joined actively, though never violently, in their campaign for votes. At one time he resigned from the Labor Party because he felt that the party leadership was not playing fair on the suffrage issue. In the midst of the excitement, Mr. Lansbury was arrested on a charge of inciting to riot, and was sentenced to jail for three months. He immediately went on a passive resistant hunger strike, and was released after three days. Though he continued his active leadership in the movement, he was not rearrested.

It was some years later, in 1919, that George Lansbury suffered a second prison sentence. This time, as Mayor of the Borough of Poplar, he refused to impose local tax levies for the London County Council, insisting that such taxes should be paid by the wealthy rather than by the impoverished poor.

His third great cause was *peace.* This was the supreme passion of his life, not only because war was ravaging the earth and threatening to destroy civilization, but primarily because the ideal of a peaceful world penetrated to the very heart of his spiritual faith in God and man. George Lansbury was a profoundly religious soul. There were mystic depths within him that were covered rather than concealed by the utter simplicity of his nature. God was to him not an article of belief but a personal experience. He lived in the presence of God, and recognized the kinship of all men in this divine reality. It was incredible to him that communion and coöperation between men should be abandoned for force and violence. The spirit of love was at work all the time in the world, and needed but to be quickened in the hearts of men to become the perfect power of human destiny. War was to him a final horror—the degradation of those who practised it as well as the destruction of those who suffered from it. He would not, and indeed could not, abandon the endeavor to end this abomination by appealing to men's better natures and awakening within them the sense of brotherhood. The Truth which Mahatma Gandhi stood for in the East, George Lansbury espoused in the West. Together, like twin stars at opposite poles, these two saints proclaimed peace

through non-violence, and brought to shame, if not to surrender, the pagan consciousness of their time.

In 1935-37, Lansbury pursued the great adventure of his life. "I have been campaigning," he said, "for peace."

> "I visited the President of the United States, former Premier Leon Blum of France, former Premier Paul van Zeeland of Belgium, and all Scandinavian Prime Ministers and Foreign Secretaries. I have seen Chancellor Adolf Hitler, Premier Benito Mussolini and other chiefs of States in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Austria. In addition, I have had many talks with representatives of Spain, Ethiopia, China, and Japan."

This quest, it will be said, was vain. War came with unprecedented ferocity and fury. But who would not rather fail in an undertaking of this kind than succeed, like Napoleon or Hitler, in martial and bloody conquest? And who knows what peace might have come, and what war averted, if the statesmen of the world had given themselves as wholeheartedly to this adventure as the self-forgetting pacifist from Bow and Bromley?

Lansbury, let it be noted, was an absolutist on this peace question. He would make no compromises with war. Tender as a child, he was yet as stern as any Puritan in his abhorrence and repudiation of evil. And war was to him the supreme evil! Yet it was the positive rather than the negative side of this problem which interested him. He sought not so much to abolish war as to bring in peace—and this not by fiat, least of all by force or even police power, but by the dominance of love within men's hearts. The New York *Times,* sympathetic not at all with Lansbury's principles, yet recognized their deep sincerity and ineffable significance:

> He knew that peace could be found only in the hearts of men; he never lost hope, in spite of the tragedy of the last eight months, that mankind would some day discover truth.

III

I met George Lansbury but once, on the occasion of his last visit to this country on his peace pilgrimage. He was sitting amid the bareness of a small hotel bedroom; he was tired after much traveling and speaking. But the inner light was burning bright, and the good heart poured itself. He looked the typical Englishman he was—round-faced, heavy, thick-set, slow-moving. There was nothing of the ascetic in his appearance. The spirit shone within, in a character of utter goodness, in a faith of unquenchable vitality, and in an idealism that recognized no defeat. He talked quietly, serenely, confidently. He knew the landscape of the world was dark, but he had caught a gleam of hope here in America. At any rate, whether hopeful or hopeless, he was determined to struggle on, and to live for what he himself was never to see—the nations at peace, and men free of fear and hate. As I got up to leave, the dear man accompanied me to the door, and then to the elevator—and waited till the car dropped me from his sight. He seemed lonely—his beloved wife had died five years before, and it was said he was never quite the same again! But there was no lifting of his labors—no thought of rest. To the end he was Europe's greatest man of peace—and he died without the Nobel Prize!

Most men disagreed with Lansbury, but all men loved and reverenced him. None ever questioned his sincerity, his courage, his selfless devotion to his ideals. None could be insensitive to his goodness of heart and singleness of aim. "He acted as if the motives of others were as pure as his own. He hated nothing except hatred itself." In him a saint walked the ways of earth, and taught the power as well as the beauty of the soul. There can be no utter despair of humankind while such men live.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Who Betrays Neutrality Betrays Peace*

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

I

American neutrality towards the endemic wars of European imperialism is an historic national policy, sanctioned by international law, which has been long-tested by experience and repeatedly re-affirmed and revised by Congress. It is a policy older and even more basic to the development of American independence, nationality, democracy, and peace than the Monroe Doctrine. The latter is, indeed, a logical corollary and extension of neutrality and republican isolation from the monarchical war system and old colonial exploitation systems of Europe, upon a continental and Pan-American scale. As such it is a counsel of prudence not to be lightly valued or whittled away in any verbal enthusiasm for Democracy or other values of civilization incompatible with war.

Our neutrality was—even at the outset, in 1793—something more than a counsel of prudence adopted by a small and weak republic without naval power, confronted suddenly by a hostile Europe engaged in unscrupulous, long-range warfare reckless of non-belligerent rights and interests. Approved originally by men as diverse in their outlook and political sympathies as Jefferson and Hamilton, and promulgated by President Washington as the most significant act of his second administration, the policy became a principle of law having the sanction of Grotius and all his successors among reputable international jurists, down to the propagandists of the League to Enforce Peace, and the League of Nations at Geneva, and their ill-starred endeavors to organize the world's peace upon a dictated treaty and a tenuous theory of universalism that became increasingly unmoral and unrealistic as the troubled years passed. That theory—the Geneva-Versailles theory—discountenanced all neutrality as being synonymous with international indifference and irresponsibility; and sought to exterminate it, first as a formidable obstacle to the participation of the United States and other republics of America in the war alliance arrayed

*This is the concluding section of Mr. Allinson's article begun in the May 6th issue under the title, "With Clean Hands and a Neutral Heart, America!"

against the Germans and their Central European and Turkish Allies, and secondly as an obstacle to the enforcement by law and the League of the terms of peace decreed by the treaties of Versailles, Saint Germain, and Trianon, treaties that were unfortunately accepted as the bases of the public law of Europe after the first World War, by all of the lawyers and most of the professors and moralists,—with the notable exception of the anti-militarists and of the United States Senate.

The Senate, it will ever be remembered, under the formidable leadership of Senators Borah, Johnson, Norris, LaFollette (pere), and the astute Henry Cabot Lodge for less disinterested reasons, refused to sanction the treaties and the punitive terms of the "peace settlement," as being incompatible with the declared democratic war aims of the American people, particularly of the 14 Points upon which the Armistice had been concluded. These men, and the widespread public opinion of which they were the spokesmen, forced the withdrawal of American collaboration with the brutal and short-sighted attempts of the Anglo-French Alliance to enforce them; and thereby endeavored to unwrite a dismal chapter of European history that had been written by bayonets and starvation, in blood and folly and tears—a chapter even now being re-written and enlarged, but not expurgated, in still more folly and blood and hunger and tears. Meanwhile, as reassurance against a repetition of these disasters, successive American Congresses and administrations re-stated, revised and refined the lawful doctrine of neutrality, endeavored to universalize it through the outlawry of warfare as an instrument of public policy in the Kellogg-Briand Pact, then to regionalize it through the Pan-American Conferences and the Argentine Anti-War Pact, and, failing universality, to forge a Pan-American version of it, in the form of a pledge of solidarity and of collective enforcement of newly-defined neutral duties as well as rights. Such was the essential objective of the diplomacy of the United States at the inter-American conferences at Buenos Aires, Lima, and Panama—by which the historic "counsel of national prudence" has become a principle of international morality and defined action, not only compatible with peace but potentially a formidable instrument of penalizing belligerents without passing superficial political judgments against them, and thereby implementing, or giving practical potency and prestige, beyond the measure given by the so-called Stimson doctrine, to the high promise of the anti-war pacts. Obviously, if warfare and the fruits of plunder and conquest are to be condemned or outlawed in the march of civilization, the non-belligerent or neutral nations must take the lead by recognizing that a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, and elementary moral considerations, require that they shall not permit their own citizens to profiteer by the unrestricted sale of the implements and machinery, the munitions and chemicals of warfare, or their law-abiding countries to become the arsenals of organized murder perpetrated by other governments with their unofficial connivance. Hence the revision of traditional and commercial, or *laissez-faire* neutrality in the direction of arms embargoes and the prohibition of the bloodstained munitions traffic—and other limitations upon the neutral "freedom of the seas" for the vindication of which Woodrow Wilson led a reluctant America to war, in 1917. Hence, likewise, the need of progressive revision and re-statement of the policy of neutrality, in step with the changing technology of warfare. And hence the importance of the New Neutrality—viewed as a carefully formulated code of non-belligerent duties as well as rights, and as a cadre of penalities against belligerent law breakers and world destroyers—in the history of international law and of Pan Americanism. It is necessary to know this recent history in order properly to appraise the great legal and practical importance of the Congressional endeavors to moralize and render both honorable and tenable the historic American doctrine of neutrality in the presence of world-chaos and outrageous wars. Despite the President's repeated failures to support it, the Congressional policy remains the high-water mark of the whole movement towards the democratic control of foreign policy and the expurgation of secret diplomacy.

II

Who betrayed American neutrality, in 1917, and who threatens again to betray it? . . . It will be recalled that the too-easy abandonment of American armed neutrality in favor of outright belligerent interventionism by the Wilson Administration, was a prelude not to peace, but to an epic tragedy. Justifiable as it then appeared to be to many Americans, in legalistic and academic, or emotional, terms, the scuttling of our neutrality, by rendering it morally untenable, was in a sense the most important contributing factor to the defeat of the "peace without victory" of Wilson's prophetic vision, in his speech of January 22, 1917. The abandonment of neutrality led straight on to the participation of a large segment of the New World in the ruthless and futile wars of the Old; and to that ultimate military victory of Anglo-French imperialism over the menacing Germanic coalition by which a Punic peace was written and the bases laid in law and policy for the destruction of international morality, the demoralization of the German and Austrian peoples, and the renewal of a titanic struggle between competitive commercial and military empires, twenty years after the bitter ink had dried upon the diplomacy of Versailles. Fate has reserved a peculiar and unenviable punishment for Mr. David Lloyd George, one of the principal authors of the Versailles system, in requiring that he should live to see the futility of his statecraft displayed in a repetition of the horrors of the European war, upon a more infernal plane—the bombing airplane—and in the return of that war, like a savage boomerang, to England.

The fateful decision of 1917 reversed the currents of American history, which had long flowed away from Europe and its wars, contributed neither to the defense of democracy, in the long run, nor to the development of law or of civilized coöperation upon any terms that deserved to endure as peace. In the revealing light of twenty years of frustration and disillusionment, of an impossible and withering peace, and of unfulfilled promises of disarmament, Wilson's decision, although ratified by Congress in an emotional midnight session, stands as the greatest of blunders from every realistic and honest American viewpoint—a blunder of political sentimentality and economic pressures, misconceived as patriotic, which promoted neither the demilitarization nor the education of the German peoples, but rather their brutalization; which advanced not so much the organization as the fatal dislocation of the capitalist world's interdependent economies— and thereby promoted not freedom and civilization but totalitarian anarchy, Machiavellian power-politics, and materialistic cynicism in an embittered world. The whirligig of time now brings its terrible revenges, and the Caesars make coronation stones

of the tombstones of liberty in the international graveyard of free people! *Sic semper tyrannisque bellae!*

What movement of thought and feeling was it that contrived to discredit and undo the bastion of American neutrality in the first World War? It was not primarily the cunning hand of the international munitions traffickers, nor any other selfish American economic pressure-group, although they played a leading rôle, consciously and unconsciously. It was, first of all, the idealists and moralists, the "Liberals" and Pan Angles, whose misreading of the war, and misuse of the war method in politics, led us to our own undoing.

Let us look, for a moment, at the almost forgotten record of the year 1916. We shall discover some astonishing facts that should give us pause. What was it that then induced the American people and their war-condemning President to abandon the neutral policy of Washington, Jefferson, and a long American tradition, in favor of intervention in the old European anarchy and imperial duel? Who was it that persuaded Mr. Wilson and, through him, an intellectually subservient Congress that neutrality and peace were incompatible? For what purposes was that tragic reversal of American policy ostensibly made? . . . It was not an American statesman who originated the dangerous notion that neutrality is obsolete. It was an English publicist, and even a "pacifist," who "sold" this great and dangerous illusian to Mr. Wilson—a man famous for his intellectual endeavors to discredit war and, perhaps,—although this may be less clear—further the interests of British political hegemony of Europe in the trans-Atlantic world. The true story of this revealing episode was told at the time in a well-remembered editorial in *The New Republic,* in its issue of September 16, 1916, on the eve of President Wilson's second campaign for the presidency in which his managers made memorable use of the illusory slogan: "He kept—and will keep—us out of war!" The fatal parallels are striking between the facts and opinions of twenty-four years ago as recorded in the columns of that distinguished American journal, then bending every editorial effort to rationalize and dignify the war adventure upon which President Wilson and his aides had already resolved to embark, unbeknown to the American people, and the trends of today. Thus ran the editorial:

> Mr. Wilson's speech of acceptance [of the nomination for the presidency] contained one sentence which overshadows anything that has been said, or will be said, during the campaign. In the years to come, that sentence will surely gather a significance which has been ignored in the heat and haste and distraction of the moment. The statement that "no nation can any longer remain neutral as against any wilful disturbance of the peace of the world" is a doctrine the importance of which it is hardly possible to exaggerate. The fact that it is uttered now by the President of the most powerful neutral, by the President of a nation which has practised and preached international *laissez-faire,* is a reversal of such importance and with such endless consequences that it would absorb our attention if we had a just perspective on our own future. Whether the tariff should be moved up, down, or sideways, whether it was wise or unwise to go to Vera Cruz, whether the eight-hour bill is right or wrong, are questions that will soon be forgotten; but the principle that neutrality is obsolete is the basis of organized peace in the world.
>
> The idea was born simultaneously in many minds in different nations. It is imbedded in Mr. Asquith's declaration that Britain is fighting for the public law of Europe. It is the residue of truth in Mr. Roosevelt's agitation about Belgium, [cf. Poland, 1939]. It is the idea behind the large movement for the League of Nations—a League to Enforce Peace, which has the general approval of Viscount Grey, M. Briand, and, it is said, even of certain members of the German Foreign Office. The President's utterance was made not into a vacuum, but as a contribution to an international cause.
>
> The particular words used by Mr. Wilson are worth noting. He speaks of neutrality as no longer feasible. This attack on neutrality originated with a man who should have the credit for it. It originated with Mr. [now Sir] Norman Angell, and the words used by the President are Mr. Angell's own words. He spent last winter (i.e., 1915-1916) in the United States lecturing and writing. In the weeks preceding the last crisis with Germany [over the Sussex affair], *he formulated the doctrine that neutrality was obsolete.* It emerged after hours of discussion on the basis of memoranda which were recast many times. The results reached the President, not only directly, but through his confidential advisers; and there can be no doubt that the most important sentence in Mr. Wilson's speech of acceptance of the nomination was written by Mr. Norman Angell . . . who served his country and ours beyond all Englishmen who have come to us since the War began. He drew us closer to that England with which alone an Anglo-American understanding is possible.

The editors of *The New Republic* were then in a singular position to know whereof they spoke. Some of them were, in fact, confidential advisers of President Wilson, and assistants in the preparation of his "moral" war aims and peace terms. That the abandonment of American neutrality served the interests of the American people, or the cause of Democracy, is not so clear in 1940 as it was in 1916. It is not so clear even to the present editors of *The New Republic,* we surmise, who must smile ruefully in perusing the files of their own journal, with its starry-eyed acceptance of the bloodiest war in recorded history, which had the most cruel aftermath of general demoralization and disillusionment of the sometimes civilized world! Would they not now be inclined to place at their masthead the motto: *"Timeo Brittaniae et propagandam ferentes!"?* Ideas, verily, are weapons on the anvils of propagandists! How can men know the truth that shall set them free—in wartime? Is neutrality "obsolete"? Who sought to make it so—and is seeking to do so even now? Who is behind this stirring propaganda for "Union Now"—for a plausible federation of the "fifteen North Atlantic democracies"? Has it any other ulterior purpose than to cajole the American people into another "moral crusade" for peace, by plunging into the rescue of the British and French empires from the embarrassments and disasters to which their own obtuse and timid leadership and international duplicities have led them? Having sown the winds of reckless disregard of economic suffering and political disintegration in Central Europe, in Manchuria, in Spain, in the Balkans, for which the terms of their treaty of Versailles were largely responsible, they are now reaping the whirlwinds of horror and calamity from which it is too late to rescue them, even if the well-meaning and naive American people were disposed to try.

Neutrality is not obsolete when all Latin America as well as certain democratic European states, members of the League of Nations itself, are neutral today in the war that is unrolling its crimes over Europe. Despite the outrageous invasion of the Low Countries, the case for neutrality is by no means lost.

Are we to be cajoled or deluded once again into squandering our democracy in the amphitheatre of war? If not, we must determine to remain resolutely neutral to the end of this deceptive war, at whatever temporary material sacrifice of war profits; or permanent sacrifice of our prejudices in favor of Anglo-French commercial and political hegemony.

Political memories are incredibly short and dull. Evidently it can happen here, even twice within the same generation! History is repeating itself with shocking depravity today in Europe—and the tragedy is essentially one of psychological misunderstanding between the German and British peoples, and of political misrepresentation all around. It was Lincoln, however, who said something about rulers being unable to fool all of the people all of the time—in America. Let us pray that this remark is still true; and that if honest and impartial neutrality is to be abandoned, the abandonment will not be "sold" to the American people by their emotional leadership as a justifiable betrayal of their own history and better counsel, or by those who profess to believe in international justice, charity, democracy and peace—but rather that it will be presented for what it will really be—a covert, or overt, act of war in behalf of those who command the high seas with superior naval power (not necessarily by a superior cause), and command, likewise, the bewildered and gullible American mind by their superior arts of propaganda, as they commanded both, in 1917, for their own ends, not ours.

Those who preached so eloquently "the moral aims of the war," in 1917, will shortly be about the same misleading business again. They can only hope to succeed by persuading us of the reality of some moral goal of their statesmanship by which to lead us to the shambles, some quixotic hope of a new "federal reorganization" at least of vanquished states for the better protection of the victors, which will appear to compensate us for abandoning our historic moorings. Our valiant endeavor to terminate a military tyranny and establish the bases of a just and enduring peace by overthrowing the Kaiser and the war system of Europe was an epic failure, in every moral and political sense, in 1918. Congress, in the light of this bitter experience, in the face of Executive opposition has striven to formulate and develop American foreign policy in a way that would effectively restrain the perennial tendency of diplomats to "meddle" in the tangled affairs of the Old World, under the delusion that America can reform Europe or dissuade its imperial duelists from periodically committing collective suicide. Woodrow Wilsonism is, temporarily, as dead as a doormouse among the American people at large, today, in the onset of the Second European War. But the friends of Wilsonism and of European interventionism are alive in the cloisters, if not the chancellories, of the land; and most of them are waging a kind of guerilla warfare against American neutrality and the brave idea of collaboration with the other neutrals of the world in opposition to the extension of belligerent menace and pretension, in the present atrocious war whose outcome no sibyl this side of the Kremlin can predict!

It should never be forgotten that our carefully-matured program of insurance against involvement in foreign wars, for which the progressive block of leaders of the Senate are chiefly responsible—such men as Senators Bennett Champ Clark, of Missouri, Homer T. Bone, of Washington, Gerald Nye, of North Dakota, Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan, and the late Senator Borah, most courageous of all independent voices in the Senate in condemning the collusions and conspiracies of the munitions-traffickers—was designed to meet exactly the international situation that has now arisen in Europe. That program calls for a resolute abandonment of the profiteering tradition of an irresponsible commercial *laissez-faire*—an abandonment of the technical letter of neutrality in favor of trust in the true spirit and principle of neutral impartiality. The Presidential policy, on the other hand, proposes a surrender of the moral spirit, in favor of a partial, legalistic, and disingenuous commercial neutrality which, upon analysis, proves to be indefensible by any other argument than one of seeking to aid and abet the Allied empires in their present war, without requiring any definition from them of their concrete aims, and without requiring any major sacrifice of American interest or profit, aiming to keep the war trade without its risks. This, however, places the nation in an invidious and discreditable light. We are either for their war and war system, desiring the triumph of one side, or we are against both, wishing "a plague on both their houses," which is the spirit of historic neutrality and Americanism, operating as a force for peace and the sanctity of international law.

No nation can pursue two antithetical foreign policies—neutrality and munitioneering—simultaneously. Such, in the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans, we seem to be blundering into doing, while neglecting to forge that close and loyal collaboration with the other neutral nations of the world whose commerce is the principal victim of the present "totalitarian" conflict and to whose defense—if to any other's—we might be most justified in advancing. Peace must be waged no less courageously than war, if it is ever to be vindicated and the cause of international law to be respected as something more than Platonic in a brutal world. The United States, with the "other Americas" at its side, alone wields sufficient moral and material force to wage this kind of peace, and to bring the belligerents of Europe and Asia to book, by economic and moral pressures, applied at the right time and place, if necessary in the spirit of law. Have we learned nothing from a long national experience? Are we doomed to surrender to cowardice and confusion, or the remorseless intrigues of foreign propagandists in our midst? The answer of an educated patriotism must be "No!" Democracy and Americanism are challenged. They can, and must, save themselves by coöperative effort in other ways than war.

If we would successfully interdict warfare, we shall be well-advised not to abandon the lessons of historic experience and the counsel of Washington, Jefferson, Thomas Paine, and our greatest political thinkers; and not to look to a universal organization of an inchoate world-community—a League of Nations, or a "Federal Union of World Democracies"—as the sole means of attaining it. We shall begin by defending the Western Hemisphere against those who are seeking to divide and involve it in the train of the great belligerent criminals of Europe and Asia. We shall vindicate the laws of neutrality, and defend those who are so circumstanced that they must put their trust in them against the threats of annihilating force. We shall not abandon the good that we have gained under the illusion that neutrality is incompatible with the organization of peace, in the Western Hemisphere or in the world. On the contrary, *collective neutrality* and anti-war embargoes may prove to be the most feasible approach to world law and world government, and to the vindication of the noble promise of the Kellogg Pact. The problem of national defense in a world of war, the supreme problem before us today, is a political and a moral one—not a military one—a problem of the adequate organization of our own hemisphere for life and for democracy.

Uncle Sam, Benedict

O. A. HAMMAND

So long as Uncle Sam was a bachelor and kept his own books and pressed his own clothes, he was free to take a look across the deep blue waters toward Europe or in any other direction and indulge in an international affair if he felt disposed to do so. But when he married Miss Monroe Doctrine all was different.

The first child was named Protective Tariff, the second Immigration, and the third Naturalization. This constituted the whole family for a while and then came the twins, Isolation and Big Navy. Afterward another youngster blessed the union, this time, Deportation. When Uncle Sam took on Monroe, he probably did not know what he was in for, nor how big an influence she would have on his manner of living. The lady wanted America for Americans, and was set on preventing colonization on this side of the ocean, either north or south, by any foreign power.

It could hardly be said that she needed two continents for her own development and prosperity, yet that is just what she wanted and her policy was to maintain it. To start with, Tariff began to play around with Infant Industry and continued to play around until Infant Industry had grown big and fat and had got a bad name, and had gone into politics in a big way; and controlled business, elected United States Senators, and dictated national conventions.

For many years Immigration was very democratic and invited in all his friends, but when enough had arrived so it seemed possible to hold the great plains and the fertile valleys of the new continent, Immigration became a little different and was no longer opening his doors. Naturalization was likewise quite liberal at first and then suddenly decided to be rather exclusive.

Many of the neighbors believe that the whole program of the children has been dictated by their Mother Monroe. Isolation was a frail and nervous youngster, afraid of everything and always ready to scream; and her twin brother, Big Navy, has always run to Congress for money to build more ships to protect Little Icy. Nobody in this family ever died or quieted down or quit acting up or asking for money. It looks as if the family has taken over Uncle Sam and dominated his whole life. Monroe wanted Porto Rico to protect Florida and the Gulf Coast, and then wanted the Panama Canal to protect Porto Rico. She got the west coast; and then wanted the Hawaiian Islands and the Samoan Islands to protect them, and then wanted Guam to protect the Philippines. She wanted airplanes and subs and bigger and better battleships and now wants the Nicaragua Canal and the Florida Canal to protect the Panama Canal. It seems like nothing is able to protect itself; so Little Icy is nervous and Big Navy always runs for the money.

Before Isolation was born there was trade and travel back and forth between Uncle Sam and John Bull and other foreign neighbors, and it seemed as if foreigners might be friends; but after Little Icy came, Uncle Sam quit his friendship with John Bull and remained in his own home like a hermit and became suspicious of his old friends and customers, and restricted travel and trade, though it upset his economy and almost bankrupted him. No matter how high a wall Tariff might build, nor how close Immigration might become, nor how arbitrary Naturalization might get, nor how their actions might affect their neighbors, it made no difference.

With all the resources at his command, Uncle Sam does not hit it off very well. He has changed from an economy of scarcity to an economy of plenty but still it does not do him any good. Tariff has changed his wall a dozen times, but usually makes it higher, even though he knows that if he will not trade with his neighbors, his neighbors cannot trade with him. Uncle Sam never knows just where he is, and always has to borrow money to support the family, subsidize business, provide spending money for Big Navy, and feed the poor.

All this time Big Navy is talking about protecting the family interests, but has never found out for sure just what the family interests are or just what he is supposed to protect. Deportation keeps busy hunting down aliens in his own household and trying to send them back home, yet Uncle Sam's aliens have gone into other people's homes all over the world, built banks and factories, and dug mines and oil wells, and, of course, want to remain Uncle Sam's aliens. When they get into trouble or anything happens they always yell for the protection of the home flag and Big Navy.

Some observers think that Uncle Sam does not have any foreign policy at all, only just the reaction of a confused domestic policy. Certainly the union with Miss Monroe Doctrine has produced a provincial family which is extremely selfish and unreasonable, and haunted by the fear that somebody will take away their possessions. This attitude of suspicion has kept many undesirable neighbors out of his backyard, but it has also prevented economic and political coöperation and created problems both in the Western Hemispere and throughout the world.

A Pure White Light Is Always Shining

PAUL de GUZMAN

"Cuts Away 4 Ribs, Stitches Up Heart." This news item was in the Philadelphia *Evening Ledger* of Wednesday, April 10th. It was probably in many other newspapers. Here is what it said:

"New York, April 10.—(UP)—Mrs. Eloise Edralin, 19, picked up a pistol a boarder left in her home. Somehow it was discharged and the bullet ripped through her chest, puncturing her heart.

"An ambulance surgeon, amazed to find her still alive, took her to Knickerbocker Hospital. A hurry call brought Dr. William A. Fraser, one of the city's best-known surgeons, on the run.

"Fraser discarded his clothing as he hastened to the operating room and by the time Mrs. Edralin was wheeled in, he was ready to operate.

"Working with incredible speed, Dr. Fraser cut four

ribs away from the breastbone, severing the muscles so that he had a sort of trapdoor. Then he reached in and took the quivering heart in his hand.

"A puncture of the left ventricle sent blood spurting with every beat. Dr. Fraser motioned for needle and silk thread. As each heart beat quieted, he took a stitch. Then he waited for another moment of quiet and took a second stitch. A third stitch closed the wound.

"But another complication appeared. The loss of blood had seriously weakened Mrs. Edralin. The patient's blood type had been charted the moment she entered the hospital, and Dr. Morris Kleinberg, an interne standing by, knew his blood was the same. He climbed on a table beside the operating table, and a quart of blood was pumped from his arm into Mrs. Edralin's veins.

"The hospital revealed the amazing story today and said that she would recover completely."

I clipped the article. To save. To reread. To show to people. For miracle of miracles—a great surgeon through his skill, and by the grace of God, had saved a life that otherwise would have been lost.

That same evening I mentioned this splendid story to my wife. I drew the clipping from my wallet for her to read. "Read it aloud," I said, "It's a beautiful story."

This is what she read:

"At the entrance of the Kattegat, down the Swedish coast, a terrific naval engagement was reported being fought. Two German troop transports and two German warships were said to have been sunk."

"Why," I interrupted. . .

"This isn't it," she said.

"Never mind," I answered, "Read it anyway."

She read on . . .

"Earlier today, British and French naval forces were reported to have recaptured from the Germans Narvik, Trondheim and Bergen, on the west coast of Norway. C. J. Hambro, president of the Norwegian Parliament, confirmed the recapture of Trondheim.

"At least twenty ships have been sunk in two days.

"The Stockholm radio reports indicated that the British navy had penetrated German mine fields in the Skagerrak and that the battle was for control of that sea passage, and with it control of German communications with the forces landed in Norway.

"Watchers along the coast said at 8:30 P. M. the battle was still raging and the impression among observers at Goteborg was that the British warships, aided by planes of the R.A.F., had gained the upper hand.

"One ship was observed to sink and the other was said to be burning."

Yes, this note of wholesale death—death by thousands—was on the reverse of my clipping of a surgeon's great work. A work—a seeming miracle—which saved exactly one life.

I laughed in mockery. Then, suddenly ashamed, I felt all quiet inside. My wife looked at me strangely.

"Yes," she said, "I know what you're thinking. It's a grim joke. A horse laugh from the gods of darkness."

"I did think that," I said, "at first. But only for a fleeting second. And then something within me removed that bitterness. For that doctor's story—his saving of a life against almost hopeless odds, and the very fact that he did it at a time when across the sea thousands are dead and dying—is all the proof I need that God is with us; that that which is honest and good in this world shines forth steadfastly—a pure white light."

Let us salute Dr. Fraser, you and I and the world. Not for his skill and surgery—great as it is—but for reminding us that the true in heart will ever conquer the evil of this world, and one day purge it everlastingly.

A pure white light is always shining. Let us not lose heart. Let us not lose faith.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention. *Editor.*]

XIV

Mrs. Eleanor B. Roosevelt, in a speech reported by the Associated Press from Battle Creek, Michigan, at the height of the Norwegian crisis, said the following: "We hope we can remain at peace. When you go to war you cease to solve the problems of peace. This nation has a responsibility to go on to solve the world's problems. By staying out of war we may be the one torch of hope in the world." She added that once the present European war has ended "our youth may be able to keep hope alive in the youth of other nations."

The Associated Press reports the following from Norman, Oklahoma:

University of Oklahoma officials announced today the expulsion of Andrew Kennedy, twenty-year-old sophomore, of New York, because of his refusal to take military training on grounds of conscientious objection.

Kennedy is the first student of the school to be expelled for this reason. Enrollment in the Reserve Officers Training Corps is required of all students under twenty-one years old.

The New York *Herald-Tribune* publishes the following news-item:

Slow but steady growth in membership since the founding last Armistice Day of the Episcopal Pacifist Fellowship, an uncompromising antiwar group, was reported at its first annual diocesan luncheon in honor of the Right Rev. W. Appleton Lawrence, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Western Massachusetts, and national chairman of the fellowship.

"Peace is possible," Bishop Lawrence said, warning that the fellowship must not become discouraged because of the spread of the war into new countries. "We must do our best to offset the defeatist attitude that Europe is a whirlpool and evenually we'll get sucked in. Get rid of your ideas of the inevitability of war. The cause is not lost until the last of us give up."

Bishop Lawrence outlined a series of rules which he believed necessary for the pacifist attitude, including the demonstration of Christian virtues in home and business relationships, the realization that "peace has its price" and that pacifism must be supported by financial contributions, and the "radiation of positive good will" toward neighbors and all foreign countries.

At a meeting of the executive council of the fellowship,

plans were discussed for the immediate registration of all conscientious objectors on a national scale. This would be done in coöperation with the National Council of the church, which is at present considering a proposal for such registration.

The Associated Press reports the following from London, England:

Sir John Anderson, Home Secretary and Minister of Home Security, told Commons today he was considering "guarded, limited provision," to enable restrictive action to be taken against propaganda deliberately designed to impede the national war effort.

It was learned Scotland Yard had served summonses on five members and officials of the Peace Pledge Union for the publication of a pacifist poster.

A resolution providing for registration of conscientious objectors among members of the denomination has been adopted unanimously by the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It was the first such action ever taken by the Church.

The resolution, as reported in the New York *Times,* follows:

Both by official resolution and by statement in pastoral letters, our Church has recognized the right of freedom of conscience for those who, though willing to risk their lives in non-combatant service, are unwilling, for conscience' sake, to take human life in war. The National Council has set up a register under the care of the executive secretary of the Department of Christian Social Relations whereon all those who supply evidence of being baptized or confirmed members of the Protestant Episcopal Church may record their convictions as conscientious objectors.

It should be clearly understood by any one registering as a conscientious objector that the mere registration of this fact carries with it no assurance that he will not be subject for conscription for military service or for some form of non-combatant military service.

The council has also approved a form for the registration, on which conscientious objectors will be required to state their reasons for objecting, and submit proof of their membership in the Church.

At the Fifth Annual Western Poets Congress, held at Los Angeles, California, six hundred delegates ranged the organized poets beside organized labor and youth "in battling for peace and security now." A banner, announcing "Public Penance for Poets' Lies Glorifying War," was held during one session by Lucia Trent, newly elected President of the Congress, and her husband, Ralph Cheyney, both clad in sack-cloth and ashes. Peace posters were displayed. Verse speaking choirs chanted peace poems. Congress was petitioned to keep America out of war.

The Department of Public Information of Columbia University reports:

Approximately 88 per cent of more than 1,500 Columbia students polled by the Columbia peace committee were against American participation in the European war. The poll indicated that 6.5 per cent favored involvement and that 4.7 per cent were uncertain.

The *Herald-Tribune* of New York publishes the following dispatch from Atlantic City:

The fifty-nine bishops of the Methodist Church appealed today to 8,000,000 Methodists in the United States to "stand as a bulwark" against forces seeking to involve the nation in war.

This declaration, contained in a 25,000-word message, read by Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of New York, was loudly applauded by the general conference of the church—the first such conference to be held since the union last year of the three major branches of Methodism.

Regarding American participation in war, the bishops declared:

"We must not yield to the fallacy that the United States must get into the war if it is to serve in establishing a new peace basis. We can serve best by staying out. The mood of either victor or vanquished in war cannot aid peace. Only those who have escaped the blood-lust of actual fighting can see a world situation steadily and see it whole. Meantime, we protest against the shipping of war supplies from the United States to any aggressor nation."

Recalling that one of the first actions of the council of bishops of the united church had been the appointment of a committee to aid the defense of conscientious objectors in case of draft, the bishops declared:

"We are not restrained from such aid by taunts that the objectors are always wise in practical affairs, for we see in their protest the exaltation of a Christian value."

The *Christian Science Monitor* publishes the following report of action taken by the General Conference of the Methodist Church at Atlantic City:

The peace policy of the newly merged Methodist Church was determined by the adoption of a hotly debated report at the denomination's General Conference.

The Methodists seek a negotiated peace. They urge the United States to collaborate in building a federation of nations through which the will to peace may become effective. They would seek surrender of a degree of national sovereignty in matters of international concern. They believe in world economic coöperation, and specify in what particulars. Rights of backward peoples concern them and they would entrust their protection preferably to the care of some international body. Universal disarmament, if and when certain preliminary steps are taken, is at the end of their long view.

The church makes no effort to bind the consciences of its members by this report, but refuses officially to endorse, support, or participate in war, and insists that the agencies of the church shall not be used in the preparation for war, but in the promulgation of peace.

"We insist," the report reads, "that the buildings of the church dedicated to the worship of God shall be used for that Holy purpose and not be any agency for the promotion of war."

Attempts were made by numerous delegates to water down the resolution. The Reverend Dr. Harold Paul Sloan, Editor of the *Christian Advocate* of New York, moved to amend by inserting the word "aggressive" to limit the kind of wars which the church refuses to promote, but he was not sufficiently supported to make the change.

Another delegate tried to eliminate the passage in which the church expressed its belief that the making of world peace involves the surrender of national sovereignty, but he was voted down.

The paragraph reads: "Nations should reserve to themselves the right to determine their own form of government and their own way of life; but they should consent to be guided by some international body in making their decisions as regards certain matters of international concern."

In supporting the report, the Reverend Dr. Ernest F. Tittle, of Evanston, Ill., Chairman of the Committee on State of the Church, said, "We must not do again what we did 20 years ago when we fought a bloody war with the mistaken idea that everything we held dear was at stake."

Dr. Tittle referred to the hysteria of war-promoting ministers at that time as a "disgrace to the Church."

The full weight of the church is put behind students in schools and colleges who seek exemption from military training on conscientious grounds. While the report concedes that there is no common judgment among Christians as to the duty of a Christian in time of war, it endorses the declaration of the Oxford Conference on this point:

"Recognizing that its members are called to live within the secular state and that in the event of war a conflict of duties is inevitable, the church should help them discover God's will, and should then honor their conscientious decisions, whether they are led to participate in or to abstain from war, and to maintain with both alike the full fellowship of the Body of Christ."

The Methodists, in their report, request the Federal Council of Churches to create a committee through which Protestant denominations which desire to do so may officially represent the interests of the conscientious objectors before the Government.

At the three-day Institute of Government, recently held in Washington under the auspices of the Women's Division of the Democratic National Committee, Miss Josephine Roche, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasurer, said, as reported in the New York *Herald-Tribune:* "We want no war, nor any part in war. We call for an unequivocal commitment that this nation be kept at peace."

A peace resolution, adopted by the American Association of Scientific Workers, reads as follows:

Science is creative, not wasteful or destructive. Yet, the same scientific advances which have contributed so immensely to the well-being of humanity are made to serve also in increasing the horrors of war. The present conflict in Europe focuses attention on this perversion of science.

The futility of war is especially clear to scientists, for war, as a method of solving human problems, is out of harmony with the rational spirit and objective methods of science. Wherever objective analysis is permitted, the great advantages of peaceful procedure in the adjustment of conflict become obvious. Scientists deplore the fact that the fruits of their efforts are exploited for the ends of death and destruction and look to the future when science will be employed only in the one struggle worthy of it—in man's never-ending contest with nature.

Scientists know that democracy and freedom of thought, which are precious to us both as citizens and as men of science, are endangered in the emotional turmoil which accompanies war. The continuance of progress now largely depends upon the scientists of the neutral nations. American scientists can best fulfill their share of this responsibility if the United States remains at peace.

We, the undersigned workers in science (including members of the American Association of Scientific Workers and other American scientists), therefore recommend to our fellow-citizens the wholehearted and unceasing support of all reasonable programs which seek a better understanding of the causes of war, and which will preserve peace for the United States and bring peace to the world.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Kinship with the Soil

The man whose life is anchored in the land,
  Who drives a plow across the fallow earth,
Who sows the seed, with faith, must understand
  And feel a vast complicity with birth.

He knows the bitter years when drouth retards
  The struggling crop; the days of breathless heat,
The ground that bakes and cracks like broken shards,
  And mocks him in the hour of grim defeat.

He sees the ruthless elements despoil
  His land, yet knows that each insensate clod
Teems with potential life: who works the soil
  Unconquered,—carries out the plans of God.

UNA MORCE GIBSON.

After the Harvest

The wings of night pass over the grain,
The wings of night, Oh, dark refrain.
After the harvest and scorching heat,
The beat of drums and marching feet.
The sunburned grain so proud and frail
Awaiting the reaper in sharp travail
Sways and bends, in anguish wails.
"We the grain have grown succulent, sweet
To feed the hungry who walk the street
The hollow cheeked, the underfed
With crusty brown loaves of Peaceful bread."
After the harvest . . . golden labor
Peace, Oh Lord, and love of neighbor.

ANN FRANCIS HILL.

Invocation to the Manitou

Out of my mouth, O Manitou!
The smoke arises.
It is not my breath, but it makes visible my breath.
My breath is the symbol of my soul.
It can mingle with the breath of my friend
Even as my soul can commune with the soul of my friend.

As this smoke is lost in the blue of the heavens
So is my soul merged with the Great Mystery.
I am part of this Great Mystery.
I am brother to the white sycamore.
I am nephew to the waterfall.
The swift eagle is my cousin.
When the sun rises I also arise
And when he goes down I sleep.

Some day, O Manitou!
I shall sleep on.
Though the birds rejoice I shall not hear them.
My uncle, the mountain, will know me no more.

It is well, for I have touched the Great Mystery
Of which I am part.

CHAPMAN J. MILLING.

The Continuous Crucifixion

["Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me."]

Each man and boy whose body breaks,
  From bayonet and shell,
Crimsons a cross of Calvary,
  Behind the gates of hell.

And at the side of every cross,—
  Though die ten million men,—
The scourged and spit-on Son of God
  Is crucified again.

EARL BIGELOW BROWN.

Little Dictators

Little dictators, you are like cartoons,
The head ten times the puny body's girth.
Let not deceptive rising of your moons
Delude your focus, conjure with your brains.
The ancient law of being,—earth to earth,—
Beyond your power to challenge, still remains.
Consider this, Italian, Jap or Hun,—
The war with time has never yet been won.
What of old Caesars whom opprobrium smothers
Implacably, Napoleon, all the others.
Despite the blatant turmoil of your breeding,
Your history page will make but casual reading.

KATHARINE BROWN BURT.

The Study Table

CHARLES A. HAWLEY

The Glory That Was Greece

THE LIFE OF GREECE. *By Will Durant.* 755 *pp. New York: Simon and Schuster.* $3.95.

Modern civilization has at last become aware of Matthew Arnold's thesis propounded seventy years ago: our civilization is the result of two traditions: Hebraism and Hellenism. Hellenism is now the preponderant influence and it is this which Will Durant discusses in his *Life of Greece.* This book, the second part of the author's projected "story of civilization," is in itself an independent survey of Greek culture. Written like the popular outline of philosophy, this book is for the layman, a genial introduction to our own heritage. With the instinct of an archaeologist, Durant begins with the earliest cultural forces in Crete and ends with the coming of Rome which in conquering Greece became its greatest missionary. This book humanizes Greek culture. Durant wisely discards military history and tells the simple story of the contribution of the Greek mind. This contribution being deathless lives on in the struggle of present-day human beings. In fact, certain phases of Greek life were strangely like our own baffling environment. The life of democracies was first lived in Athens; public works projects produced under Greek tutelage were more lasting monuments than anything the modern age can boast. The conflicts of religion and institutionalism were fought out in Greece long before the Anglo-Saxon mind sensed such problems. Whither are we bound? Study Greece. Durant's introduction is the most genial introduction to date.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

A New Edition of Pilgrim's Progress

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. *Arranged for the modern reader by E. W. Walters.* 326 *pp. Nashville: Cokesbury Press.* $2.00.

The seventeenth, the last of the great religious centuries, produced an immortal classic, *Pilgrim's Progress.* The author, John Bunyan, born in 1628 in an insignificant village, was the son of an itinerant tinker. The tinker's son had no schooling in the modern sense of the term; but he learned the King James Version of the Bible which appeared seventeen years before he was born. At twenty-five the young man passed through a mystical experience as did his contemporary, George Fox. Bunyan believed he had a great message which he must declare to a confused, warring world. He began to preach what he learned from the King James Version of the Bible. The common people heard him gladly. But certain magistrates thought his message dangerous and put him in jail as they did Fox. This was Bunyan's greatest blessing. It gave him time to write. While Charles the Second was filling the land with his restoration principles, Bunyan was writing the eternal quest of the soul of man. The present generation is in many ways like that of the time of Charles the Second. In fact, we can scarcely understand our century without knowing the seventeenth. There is the same hunger, the same bewilderment, the same despair. Our confusion has not yet produced either a Bunyan or a Fox. Until it does, we must read *Pilgrim's Progress.* Yet the present age, fed on movies and detective stories, has difficulty in reading the classics of the seventeenth century. Not long ago a student in a university well known for football is reported to have asked his English teacher to substitute Paul Bunyan for John Bunyan. Such questions have inspired this edition of *Pilgrim's Progress* for the present-day reader. Footnotes and references are gone. The format is modern, the print is excellent, the words are of one syllable, but the flavor of the great classic is all here. This edition carries us back to the reign of Queen Elizabeth when the English language was at its purest and best. Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* has made many conquests, and this edition is by no means the least.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Herald of a New Day

THE MESSAGE OF THE BOOK OF REVELATION. *By Cady H. Allen.* 180 *pp. Nashville: Cokesbury Press.* $1.50.

The Book of Revelation constantly arouses the imagination. Its pages have produced allegorizing and hypothesizing without end. And now from faraway Iran comes a new interpretation by a man who has studied the Roman world, travelled through it, and pondered its history. Cady H. Allen, one of the many graduates of Hamilton College who have given their lives to international understanding, has put together a series of lectures on the Book of Revelation which he gave in Persia. Aside from this interest of the missionary, and it is well to know what missionaries teach, this book can enable all Bible students to see the importance of an acute historical sense. The author traces the experiences of the early Christians in the Roman Empire and shows forcefully and clearly how their experiences were reflected in this collection of writings now known as the Book of Revelation. In all this he sees and formulates a philosophy of history: "The philosophy of history that underlies the Apocalypse is simple: history is a record of the contest between two ways of life—good and evil, righteousness and corruption, the life of the New Jerusalem and the life of Babylon, the way of the Lamb and the way of the Dragon. The complete triumph of righteousness is the goal of history." With the coming of this new installment of the World War, the Book of Revelation will again come into the teaching and thinking of the church. Some will find in it the announcement of the end of all things; others will find in it the herald of a new day, a day of victory. The author finds the latter, and the present reviewer trusts all who are even remotely interested in the Bible or in an interpretation of history, will get this book, read it, ponder it, and find in it a new hope.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

The Gospel Before the Gospels

THE MESSAGE OF JESUS CHRIST. *By Martin Dibelius.* 192 *pp. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.* $2.00.

This admirable study by Martin Dibelius of the earliest form of the teaching of Jesus has been translated by Professor Frederic C. Grant of Union Theological Seminary. The author has travelled in America, lectured in our theological schools, and everywhere is known as one of the outstanding interpreters of the

New Testament. The purpose of this book is to restore the earliest tradition of Jesus' teaching. Luke tells in the preface to his Gospel of the many traditions and attempts to interpret Jesus. Just what did the first hearers hear? This question Professor Dibelius attempts to answer. Sayings, parables, and mighty works (miracles) make up the simplest record. The first "heralding" of the "good news" came out of the needs of the community of Jesus' followers. After a generation the Gospels as we have them began to take permanent form. In the interval the material in a truly oriental manner circulated by word of mouth; as time went on an "ordered account," as Luke tells us, grew out of these oral sermons. This book should be studied by all who want to know the thought of Jesus in its simplest form. This is one of a series in the International Library of Christian Knowledge whose American editor is the well-known theologian, William Adams Brown.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

How Do Men Know God?

OUR KNOWLEDGE OF GOD. *By John Baillie. 263 pp. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.* $2.50.

Professor Baillie is well known to Americans. Born in Scotland, he came to America and taught in Auburn Theological Seminary and later in Union. Then he went back to Edinburgh where he holds the professorship of theology once held by Thomas Chalmers. Baillie is both philosopher and theologian, and this is the only method of approach. Knowledge of God like knowledge in general to most people is profound and always in need of explanation. But the problem has been enhanced by the years of war in which the human race has been more or less mentally and spiritually lost. Hence this book is welcome. Baillie's thesis is that God is known to us not by arguments but by experience with God himself. This thesis of course is not new, but Baillie has treated it in a new way. In spite of the profundity of the subject, the treatment of the book is so simple that the most unphilosophical mind can enjoy it.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Everyday Psalmists

THE PSALMS FOR EVERY DAY. *By Jane T. Stoddart. 382 pp. Nashville: Cokesbury Press.* $3.50.

This is a new kind of commentary which will richly reward the average Bible student or the preacher seeking illustrations. The author is the well-known British writer on Biblical literature. The Psalms have been arranged for daily study with readings for morning and evening, which, if carefully followed, will take one through the Book of Psalms in thirty days. The treatment is at once fresh and scholarly. It abounds in good wisdom and excellent illustrations. Every pastor and Sunday School teacher ought to read this book.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 82)

Petition for Peace

To the President and the
Congress of the United States:

The undersigned citizens of the United States respectfully petition the President and the Congress to formulate a specific foreign policy in order that our Government may be prepared, when the proper opportunity presents itself, to coöperate as never before in the establishment of world peace.

Some other method than war must be found to suppress dictatorships. War has failed to accomplish its objectives while destroying in the democracies the very freedom which distinguishes them from the dictatorships. Military and naval superiority are successful only temporarily. Germany was defeated and disarmed but within a generation has become a greater menace than before. If international morality is always to be determined and maintained by physical supremacy, our civilization is doomed to eternal warfare and to ultimate extinction.

While the present time appears far from propitious for establishing peace among the belligerent powers, it must be remembered that the alignment among the peace-disturbers constantly changes. Now Germany, Russia, and Japan are the aggressors, but Great Britain, France, Italy, and the United States have seized territory by force at no very distant date.

There are seven great powers which menace world peace; their voluntary acquiescence in a new world order is essential for the establishment of permanent peace. So long as these great powers are entitled under international law to seize the territory of weaker nations, or while it is expected that a majority of them may impose their will by force upon a recalcitrant minority, war will continue.

Twenty years ago, when such a proposal as we now make appeared equally ridiculous, Great Britain, France, and the United States controlled the world. Germany had been defeated and disarmed; Russia had proposed universal total disarmament; Italy and Japan had not started their aggressions. The democracies, had they been so inclined, could readily have induced the other powers to join at that time in a world federation for disarmament and stability. Instead, the victors attempted to control by force, only to find that in a brief period the balance of power had been overturned.

In order that the United States may be prepared to take advantage of the next opportunity for securing permanent peace and disarmament, we hereby petition our Government to announce its willingness to coöperate in future in forming a world federation, at the same time declaring its refusal to participate in any foreign war.

Signed:

REV. BERNARD IDDINGS BELL, warden, St. Stephens College.
REV. W. RUSSELL BOWIE, professor, Union Theological Seminary.
WILLIAM M. CALLAHAN, editor, *The Catholic Worker.*
LOWELL H. COATE, editor, *The Humanist Friend.*
PHILIP W. L. COX, professor, New York University.
JEROME DAVIS, lecturer.
WILLIAM FLOYD, editor, *The Arbitrator.*
ELISABETH GILMAN, Nat'l Committee, War Resisters League.
S. RALPH HARLOW, professor, Smith College.
GEORGE W. HARTMANN, professor, Teachers College.
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, minister, The Community Church of N. Y.
JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN, secretary, War Resisters League.
REV. JOHN PAUL JONES, Brooklyn Peace Council.
PAUL JONES, former Bishop of Utah.
REV. JOHN HOWLAND LATHROP, National Peace Conference.
WILLIAM APPLETON LAWRENCE, D.D., Episcopal Pacifist Fellowship.
WILLIAM BROSS LLOYD, JR., Campaign for World Government.
ALFRED LIEF, author.
A. J. MUSTE, minister, Labor Temple.
RAY NEWTON, American Friends Service Committee.
HARRY A. OVERSTREET, professor, College of the City of New York.
HENRY W. PINKHAM, minister who opposed the World War.
CHARLES FRANCIS POTTER, leader, First Humanist Society.
JACKSON H. RALSTON, lecturer, Stanford University.
VIDA D. SCUDDER, professor, Wellesley College.
EVAN W. THOMAS, M.D., professor, New York University.
OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, publicist.
EVA INGERSOLL WAKEFIELD, member, Women's International League.
MARY WINSOR, Women's Peace Union.
FRANCES WITHERSPOON, author, playwright.